

Supplemental

From: Joe Mogus

To: federal court eastern district new york (Case no 06CV574)

Date: 4/21/2006 9:46:22 PM

Subject: howard katz vs joe robert mogus ——— RESPONSE

Special to
JUDGE FRIEDMAN
WTS. WASH

*

1. This is true, katz lives in new york, does business there.

2. All that Glitters inc. retained po boxes at the places listed. Mr. Joe R. Mogus never did business, not one bit. Mr. katz is well aware of this, that he did, for over 20 years, business with an incorporated business, All that Glitters inc. ——— every invoice sent was to an incorporated business, All that Glitters, every check he received as payment was from, same, All that Glitter. Katz and i discussed this fact many times, he is a mature businessman. he is well aware of the reality of incorporation and the implications. he did business with All that Glitters inc.!

3. I am not qualified to answer jurisdictional questions, however that the amount is such, exceeding 75,000 dollars is not known.

4. Again, i can not comment on the appropriateness of the jurisdiction of this court, as i said in an earlier correspondence i am at a real disadvantage without my attorney P. Reiman of Berkeley Springs, West Virginia. She is now hospitalized and will remain so for as long as four months, possibly longer. This situation has just now occurred and is why i am answering, (She had intended to question this aspect - she had real issues with the jurisdiction)

5. This i can answer and am anxious to do so. I know what venue means! I also know what resides means and i certainly know where i am and where i reside. I RESIDE IN WEST VIRGINIA, NOT NEW YORK!!! I own no property in New York, do no business in New York, nor i have even been in New York since 1999. Sadly the last time i was in New York, the Trade Towers still stood ——— Simply put, what is stated, is that i reside in the district is untrue. I also want to say there seemed to be something very unfair about having the defendant forced to travel 500 miles to defend against these legal charges. The plaintiff and his attorney reside locally, i reside 500 miles away. This to me seems not right, and i beg the court to consider my request that a more mutually convenient venue be used. Harrisburgh, Baltimore, and Pittsburgh all have Federal Courts. Again i repeat the assertion made that the defendant, myself resides in the district is simply false. I also want to say the plaintiff has known me for twenty years, he knows some details of my personal life, he is well aware that at this time i am moving to the West Coast, in short this is a very difficult and chaotic time, further complicating and disadvantaging myself. This, i feel, is intentional on his part, choosing this time intending to place me at a further disadvantage.

* I want to add please if we must let us have a venue mutually convenient to both - please, consideration on this issue.